UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,755	05/08/2006	Fabrice Clerc	5284-69PUS	1496
Thomas Langer	7590 02/28/201	EXAMINER		
Cohen Pontani	Lieberman & Pavane	ZIA, SYED		
551 Fifth Avenue Suite 1210 New York, NY 10176			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2431	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/28/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Occurrence	10/578,755	CLERC, FABRICE			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	SYED ZIA	2431			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>15 December 2010</u> . 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 3-11 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-11 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers	election requirement.				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the original of the correction of the original of the original of the correction of the original of the original of the original	epted or b) \square objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	4) ☐ Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) ☐ Notice of Informal P	tte			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) LJ Other:					

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to remarks filed on December 15, 2010. Claims 1 and 3-11 are pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 3-11 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5-8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims., and subject to overcoming the rejections as discussed below

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1 and 3-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 2431

3. Regarding claim 1, 9 and 10: Applicant claims "generating an element and storing the

element" in first limitation. Applicant further claims in third limitation "deduce the element". It's not

clear to examiner what does it mean in the context of scope of claim. Are these **two** elements same?

Or different? Solving a system of independent equation can generate both scenarios.

Applicant further claim "deducing from the obtained element". It is not clear from where this element

was obtained i.e. from the database or form the equation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

1. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 USC 101 since the claims are directed to non-statutory

subject matter. Claim 10 is directed towards a computer readable medium including code stored

thereon which appears to cover both transitory and non-transitory embodiments. The

specification does not recite computer readable medium", and no specific definition is provided

to define this claimed term. The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) is

<u>required</u> to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification

during proceedings before the USPTO. See In re Zletz, 893 F.2d 319 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (during

patent examination the pending claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably

allow). The broadest reasonable interpretation of a claim drawn to a computer readable medium

Art Unit: 2431

(also called machine readable medium and other such variations) typically covers forms of non-transitory tangible media <u>and</u> transitory propagating signals per se in view of the ordinary and customary meaning of computer readable media, <u>particularly when the specification is silent</u>.

See MPEP 2111.01. When the broadest reasonable interpretation of a claim covers a signal per se, the claim <u>must</u> be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as covering non-statutory subject matter.

See In re Nuijten, 500 F.3d 1346, 1356-57 (Fed. Cir. 2007) (transitory embodiments are not directed to statutory subject matter) and Interim Examination Instructions for Evaluating Subject Matter Eligibility Under 35 U.S.C. § 101, Aug. 24, 2009; p. 2.

2. The Examiner suggests that the Applicant add the limitation "non-transitory computer-readable storage medium" to the claim(s) in order to properly render the claims in statutory form in view of their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the originally filed specification.

The examiner also suggests that the <u>specification be amended</u> to include the term "non-transitory computer-readable storage medium" to avoid a potential objection to the specification for a lack of antecedent basis of the claimed terminology."

3.

4. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 9 is not statutory because they are directed towards a system... comprising calculation means which could be implemented via software alone. Claims to software per se are not statutory. Applicant must recite some form of hardware as part of the claimed system to overcome this rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SYED ZIA whose telephone number is (571)272-3798. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William R. Korzuch can be reached on 571-272-7589. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

sz February 25, 2010 /Syed Zia/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2431